UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/842,366	04/24/2001	Deborah A. Louis Wallace	SPCI115495	6571

26389 7590 12/13/2007

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2800
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER	
NAWAZ, ASAD M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/842,366	LOUIS WALLACE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Asad M. Nawaz	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 October 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18,27-31 and 33-37* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18, 27-31, and 33-37* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the RCE received on 10/31/07. Claims 1 and 27 were amended. Claims 19-26, 32, and 38-49 were previously canceled. No other claims were added or canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-18, 27-31 and 33-37 are pending.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 27 is objected to because of the following informalities: "Web sit" should be re-written as "Web site". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-18, 27-31 and 33-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papadopoulos et al (SUPN: 6,282,454) further in view of Haverstock et al (USPN: 6,401,131).

As to claim 1, Papadopoulos teaches a system for providing information regarding the operation of a control system comprising a web server module (30, Fig 2) associated with said control system (32, Fig 2, programmable logic controller is a control system) said web server module having a memory operative to store a non-

markup language web site database that may be used to dynamically generate a website, wherein the web site may be provided by the web server module to provide information regarding the operation of the control system (col 4, lines 36-65) and a computer operative to receive user defined non-markup language configuration data defining said website to store said configuration data as said non-markup language we site database, and to transmit said non-markup language web site database to said web server module (col 3, lines 48-60, col 4, lines 1-35).

However, Papadopoulos does not explicitly indicate that the data defines attributes of said web site. Haverstock et al teaches a system and method for viewing production information and generating web pages in which a web server opens a template file related to the requested web page, creates hyperlinks and other information content by executing database references embedded within the template file to generate a markup language page and a web server module configuration application operative to create said non-markup language web site database and to transmit said database to said web server module in response to the request (col 10, lines 27-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Haverstock into those of Papadopoulos to make the system more efficient and customizable. Haverstock's disclosure would allow one to create and update the data records of an information database in response to user manipulation of the GUI.

As to claims 2 and 3, Papadopoulos teaches the system wherein said wbe server module is operative to receive a request for a web page of said web site and to

dynamically generate a markup language web page from said web site database in response to said request and transmit the translated data to the client (col 4, lines 1-5).

As to claim 4, Papadopoulos teaches the web site database further comprising a security profile map defining security level and privilege information for one or more servers, and wherein said web server module is further operative to identify a user associated with said request and to determine if said user is authorized to receive said web page based upon an entry in said security profile map associated with said user (col 4, lines 11-21)

As per claim 5, Papadopoulos teaches Web site database further comprises data defining a Web page comprising a table for reading or writing the contents of a memory register contained within said control system (Col. 5, L20-29., web site contains tables for reading/writing data retrieved from control system).

As per claim 6, Papadopoulos teaches the system of claim 2, wherein said Web site database further comprises data defining a Web page comprising a non-text rendering of read or write data corresponding to contents of a contained within said control system (Col 6, Lines 5-10, Lines 17-26)

As per claims 7-8,Papadopoulos teaches said request comprises a request for said Web page comprising a table and non-text rendering, and wherein said Web server module is operative to identify said memory register, to determine the contents of said memory register, and to create said Web page comprising a table containing said contents of said memory register (Col. 8, Lines 40- 44., upon receiving a request from a

client, web server retrieves PLC data from control system to store in its table and dynamically create a web page to send to the client device).

As per claim 9 Papadopoulos teaches said Web server module is electrically connected to said control system controller through a backplane interface (col. 4, lines 21-24).

As per claim 12, Papadopoulos teaches said request comprises a hyper-text transport protocol request and wherein said request is received from a Web browser executing on said remote computer (Col. 4, Lines 1-5).

As per claims 13-14, Papadopoulos teaches said dynamically generated markup Language Web page comprises a Web page identifying an alarm generated by said Web server module through the monitoring of data for said control system (Col. 10, Lines 1-7., client user can view the status event (e.g., alarm) of the control system via its browser software through the web site).

As per claim 15, Papadopoulos teaches said Web server module further comprises an Ethernet interface for receiving said non-markup language (e.g., PLC data) Web site database and said requests and wherein said dynamically generated markup language Web page may comprise a Web page providing information regarding the status of said Ethernet interface (Col. 4, Lines 55-58,' web server uses Ethernet interface for communications).

As per claim 17, Papadopoulos teaches said dynamically generated markup language Web page comprises a Web page providing system administrator or specific user-allowed access that allows active browser session modification of said security

profile privileges (Col. 4, Lines 1 1-21., user can update security parameters of the system as desired).

As per claim 18 Papadopoulos teaches said Web server module is further operative to receive a plurality of said requests and wherein said dynamically generated markup language Web page may comprise a Web page identifying a like plurality of users connected to said Web server module and associated with said plurality of requests (Col. 3, Line 66 - col. 4, line 5., web site processes plurality of requests from plurality of users as required).

Claims 19-15, 17-21, 24-42 contain similar limitations as the above mentioned claims and are thus rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 10, 11, 16, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papadopoulos and Haverstock in view of Sharood et al, 6,453,687 (hereafter Sharood).

As per claims 10, 11, 16, 22 and 23, neither Papadopoulos nor Jammes show the Web server module being electrically connected to said control system controller through a serial or network interface.

In an analogous art to the claimed invention, Sharood shows a module that is electrically connected to a control system controller through a serial or network interface (F2, E204 & E2O6, C5, L21-28). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the ad at the time of invention to modify and/or combine the teachings of Papadopoulos and Sharood by allowing a various communication channels (e.g., serial

or network ports) to connect to the web server module to enhance the compatibility interfaces of the web server module with various devices.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are not persuasive. Applicant argues in substance that none of the cited references teaches "user-defined" configuration data.

6. In response, Papadopoulos teaches that "[u]sing a web browser at a remote location through the Internet 14, a user can control and view configuration information of the PLC 32" (col 4, lines 43-46). Therefore, by virtue of the user controlling the configuration, the configuration information is defined by the user in part. Thus, the cited references still meet the scope of the limitations as currently claimed.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Asad M. Nawaz whose telephone number is (571) 272-3988. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AMN

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER